

Re: massless or massive photon?

Re: massless or massive photon?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg01200.html>

- *From:* "Juan R." González-Álvarez <juanREMOVE@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 14 Jul 2008 11:16:53 +0200 (CEST)
-

Eric Gisse wrote on Sun, 13 Jul 2008 14:10:01 -0700:

On Jul 13, 5:35 am, "Pmb" <physics_wo...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Juan R. González-Álvarez" <juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote
in
messagenews:pan.2008.07.13.11.15.33@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Eric Gisse wrote on Sat, 12 Jul 2008 13:24:46 -0700:

On Jul 12, 7:20 am, "Juan R."
González-Álvarez
<juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

[snip]

See this is what happen
when you think you know
physics :-)

I was wrong on a subtle technical point. It
happens.

Subtle? You call a major misunderstanding of the Lagrangian subtle?
Thinking that $L = T - U$ works in relativity is far from being subtle.
Its a serious misunderstanding

Re: massless or massive photon?

Yet neither you or Juan could explain why it was wrong.

Of course crackpot!

It is pretty obvious it was just a chance we found five or more consecutive mistakes in your posts ($H = L$), $H < 0$, the square root, $(T + V)$ and $(T - V)$, $H(v)$ and so on. I will cite the complete list in USENET guidelines.

It was also a chance that Juan wrote the right Lagrangian and then derived the right Hamiltonian from the Legendre...

Each time we find a mistake in your usual nonsensical postings, may be explained like a kind of cosmic chance: it is pretty obvious that others find your outrage and obvious mistakes but without knowing why and point to correct expression also by magic coincidence.

This is known like the "Eric law of self-delusion".

"Self-delusion" because you are lying nobody more than yourself :-)

If you want me to persist in believing that I'm right and your not, the quickest way to doing that is sit there and shrilly shriek about how wrong I am and then refuse to explain yourself.

Like Daryl said, bad faith arguing.

Both you and Daryl proved your definition of "good faith".

You insulted to Pete several times saying that he was in mistake (when he was just pointing your numerous errors). Pete was *right* and you completely *wrong* as now you even accept that, still you have not rectified not a single of your former insults to Pete.

Daryl defined a crackpot like someone who writes the correct Lagrangian the correct Legendre, the correct Hamiltonian and point to other right points as the fact that H cannot be negative in SR.

Daryl did not defined as crackpot someone (e.g. Eric) who wrote the wrong Lagrangian the wrong transformation, the wrong Hamiltonian, wrong negative energies...

Daryl just repeated the stuff contained in the original poster (e.g. the correct transformation and the correct final Hamiltonian are in the original poster by me) and also pointed the Lagrangian in proper frame which, except by a minus sign was already present in a 2007 blog article

Re: massless or massive photon?

Re: massless or massive photon?

<http://canonicalscience.blogspot.com/2007/08/relativistic-lagrangian-and-limitations.html>

All Daryl wrote is already present in both the original message and the blog article from the same author he insulted as crackpot. That is Daryl definition of "good faith" and this will be adequately noticed in the guidelines.

Yes, I didn't know/completely forgot that the Lagrangian has to be quadratic in the generalized velocities for that to hold – that's my mistake, but still not a large as one as you want to believe.

This is another lie. You did about six or seven *serious* mistakes would perplex any teacher or undergraduate student. Each one of your mistakes was detected and noticed even when you negated that after.

However,
both you and Juan are still intellectually dishonest people who do not argue fairly. You treat it like it is a contest, rather than as a chance to learn.

This is a very dishonest accusation will be also cited in the guidelines. When a guy want to learn, heard others are saying him and don't start to insult them whereas rejecting did any mistake.

For example Pete noticed that your Lagrangian was wrong since very early but you claimed he had not noticed the lack of the square root.

And when finally proven to be wrong then you would write "Sorry I was wrong you are right" instead trying to play this liar game.

No, it was outrage mistake that nobody else did, except another
crackpot: Dono :-)

All you could do was stamp your feet and
scream about how wrong I
was. When pressed you couldn't/wouldn't

Re: massless or massive photon?

Re: massless or massive photon?

explain why.

Ha ha ha ha ha ha ha

I predicted in a previous post to Pete you would try some lye as this when you could not hide your mistake more and... look and I was *right*.

Jesus it is "lie", lye is sodium hydroxide.

I'm waiting for him to post his *derivation*. IF you'd like I can e-mail the dervation to you so you can compare it with Eric's sure to be mistake? I'd post it here but I want to see if Eric can do it himself.

Pete

Why should I? Neither of you are interesting in learning – you are just looking for another opportunity to crow.

That is not true, I want learn how many idiocies a man as you can post, how you insult other being right when simply point your mistakes, how many ways to misread something you can, how many lies you will be inventing for next weeks to hide your nonsenses...

I also said you that I was learning all that for a future version of guidelines and I communicated this in public. And you agreed. Remember?

If I get it wrong in any way, you got what you are looking for. If I get it right, you simply claim I "copied it from a textbook" to save face.

This was Dono accusation.

--

Center for CANONICAL |SCIENCE)
<http://canonicalscience.org>

Re: massless or massive photon?

Re: massless or massive photon?